

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ELIAS TORRES RAMIREZ,
Plaintiff,
v.
TAYLOR ALISON SWIFT,
Defendant.

Case No. 24-cv-02728-KAW

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS**

Re: Dkt. No. 2

On May 7, 2024, Plaintiff Elias Torres Ramirez filed the instant case against Defendants Taylor Swift, Travis Michael Kelce, and “Theresa Tommasi and Val.” (Compl. at 1-2.) Plaintiff alleged that he and Ms. Swift are “married with a Holy Covenant Marraige [sic],” and that he “need[s] a Gaurdianship [sic] and concervtorship [sic] over her immediately.” (Compl. at 3.) Plaintiff further asserts that Mr. Kelce is infringing on his “sacred Relationship,” and seeks “[i]mmmediate kill orders for this individual in defence [sic] of my spouse and family.” (Compl. at 4.) Plaintiff also filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP application”), in which he asserts he is married to Ms. Swift, asserts that his bank name and address is “True Link/Apunum Consevrtorship [sic] for the purposes of people stealing. people at my current location continue to burglarize my place.” (Dkt. No. 2 at 2, 3.) In signing his IFP application, Plaintiff “declare[d] under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and understand that a false statement herein may result in the dismissal of my claims.” (*Id.* at 4.)


This is not the first case Plaintiff has filed against Ms. Swift, nor is it the first time he has asserted that he is married to Ms. Swift in his IFP application. (*See* Case No. 23-3826-AMO, *Ramirez v. Swift*, Dkt. No. 3; Case No. 23-3844-CRB, *Ramirez v. Gienger*, Dkt. No. 10.) Indeed, Plaintiff’s IFP application has been denied and his case dismissed based in part on his IFP

1 application containing false statements that he is married to Ms. Swift. (*See Ramirez v. Gienger*,
2 Dkt. Nos. 14 (recommending dismissal of case for failure to provide a complete and accurate IFP
3 application based on Plaintiff's false statements that he is married to Ms. Swift), 19 (adopting
4 report and recommendation).)

5 Accordingly, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's IFP application because it contains false
6 statements. Plaintiff may pay the full filing fee by July 5, 2024. Failure to do so will result in the
7 Court reassigning the case to a district judge with the recommendation that the case be dismissed
8 for failure to pay the filing fee.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: May 31, 2024

11 
12 KANDIS A. WESTMORE
13 United States Magistrate Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28